

leaders of the two rival sects of Jainism: Kumudacandra is the head of the Digambaras, Devasuri that of the Śvetāmbaras, while Siddharāja takes the chair. The issue under discussion is whether or not women can attain salvation. According to the Digambaras, they cannot; according to the Śvetāmbaras, they can. The latter view maintains that, while salvation is beyond the capacities of most women, it is within the reach of those few possessed of *sattva* (the quality of purity or goodness). Devasuri cites as evidence women from mythology (such as Sītā) and from the contemporary world (such as Mayanallā, the queen-mother, who ruled as regent for many years while Siddharāja was a boy). The discussion reveals the two opposing poles of prejudice: the reverence shown to a few individual idealized women (whether real or mythical), and the contempt shown to women in general (*Mudritakumudacandraprakaraṇa* V; cf. Sandesara 1953:362–3).

The second approach in support of the thesis that women are wicked also allows exceptions, but on the level of a class or type of woman rather than an individual. This view takes up the radical — if theoretically illogical — distinction between a woman's nature (*strīsvabhāva*) and her ordained function as wife (*strīdharma*), and pits one against the other. All fear and condemnation is directed at women as biological creatures, representatives of wild or untamed nature. Hence the pollution taboos surrounding the physical aspects of being female: menstruation, sexuality, childbirth. Hence the condemnation of female emotion and passion. All praise is directed at women as social entities, paragons of virtue in whom the biological is tamed and controlled. This tension between 'culture' and 'nature', between 'society' and 'the wild', is a familiar one to social anthropologists (e.g. E. Ardener 1975; Okely 1975). For any class, race or even nation outside the self-imposed barriers of a given group may be classified as 'the wild'; women, gypsies or the Japanese. Both fascinating and terrifying, women as women are condemned. But if they allow themselves to be controlled by their ordained function as wives, the condemnation reserved for women no longer applies.

This is evidently Tryambaka's own advice. If, by the appropriate behaviour, women transform themselves into devoted wives, then the inherent evil of their female natures — the 'inauspicious marks' (*alakṣaṇam*) of a female birth — will be annulled (note 41). Tryambaka's treatise describes precisely how this miracle may be wrought.

IV. The Duties Common to (all) Women

(*strīṇāṃ sādharmaṇā dharmāḥ*; Sdhp.22r.8–48v.6)

I shall present the remainder of Tryambaka's lengthy treatise in the form of a summary. This fourth section is divided into nine major topics, following Tryambaka's own rather loose subdivisions.

General rulings on behaviour (Sdhp.22r.9–25r.10)

Many of the quotations in this section have been quoted verbatim in earlier ones. For example, a woman should not expose her navel, ankles or breasts (Sdhp.22r.10–23v.1 = Sdhp.7r.5–6, section IIA, p.90, note 69). She should wear *haridrā*, collyrium, *kumkuma*, *sindūra*, a short-sleeved bodice and so on (Sdhp.22v.5–7 = Sdhp.7r.9–7v.1; section IIA, p.96, note 73). Without being told to do so, she should make ready all the items for worship (Sdhp.23r.7–9 = Sdhp.12v.6–8, 4r.3–4; section IIC, p.179, note 35). She should eat her husband's left-overs, saying 'This is a great *prasāda*!' (Sdhp.23r.9–10 = Sdhp.18r.6–7; section IIC, p.222, note 108). She should never be alone, nor bathe naked (Sdhp.23v.7 = Sdhp.6v.8; section IIA, p.84, note 63); and so on.

Others reinforce rulings already given and are discussed in the relevant sections. For example, she should never answer back even when scolded, nor show her anger or resentment even when beaten (Sdhp.23r.4–5; see section IID, pp.242–3). She should not go to festivals or public gatherings, on pilgrimages, or to such things as weddings or public shows (Sdhp.23v.2; see section IIB, p.137, note 38). If she wants to bathe in a sacred place, she should drink the water used to bathe her husband's feet, for her own husband is superior to even Śaṅkara or Viṣṇu (Sdhp.23v.10–24r.1; see section IIB, p.137, note 39). The good wife never loves another man whether he bribes her with fine things, begs her humbly, or seizes her by force; if he looks at her, she does not meet his eyes; if he smiles at her, she does not smile back; if he speaks to her, she does not answer (Sdhp.24.1–5; see section IIC, p.175); and so on.

In addition, we may note the following rulings that are representative of this section. According to a quotation attributed to Āśvalā-

yana, the qualities of the ideal wife include 'devoted service to her parents-in-law and, especially, to her husband; co-operation with her husband in religious matters (*dharmakārye 'nukūlatvam*); restraint in economic matters (*arthakārye 'pi samyamam*); bold confidence in sexual matters (*prāgalbhyam kāmakāryeṣu*; cf. section IID, pp.237–8); cleanliness of body, an auspicious presence, and a gentle tongue'.¹ With regard to her husband, according to a quotation from the *Rāmāyaṇa*, 'even if he is wicked, licentious or poverty-stricken, he is — for inherently noble women — the supreme deity (*paramam daivatam*)',² and her guru.³ 'When she sees him returning home from outside, therefore', according to a quotation attributed to the [*Smṛti*]-*saṃgraha*, 'she should lovingly hurry to bring him water, food, betel, and a fan to cool him; then she should do such things as massage his feet and speak in an engaging or amorous way (*cāṭuvacanaiḥ*) so as to drive away his cares'.⁴ The section ends with a well-known *subhāṣita* (attributed here to the [*Smṛti*]-*saṃgraha*). 'A father gives within limits, a brother and son as well; but a husband's giving is unlimited — what wife will not worship him?'⁵

Things to be avoided (varjanīyāḥ; Sdhp.25r.10–25v.6)

This is in fact an artificial subdivision. For although the quotations do indeed spell out the activities a good wife should avoid, the

1. *āśvalāyanaḥ* // *bhaktim śvaśurayoh kuryāt patyus cāpi viśeṣataḥ* / *dharmakārye* [']*nukūlatvam arthakārye 'pi samyamam* // *prāgalbhyam kāmakāryeṣu śucitvam nijavigrahe* / *maṅgalaṃ satatam patyuh satatam priyabhāṣaṇam* // Sdhp.22v.3–5 (Āśv.) < Sm.M.I.p.158 (Vyāsa).

2. *ayodhyākānde sītām praty anasūyāvākyam* // Sdhp.24v.9–10. *duḥśīlāḥ kāmavṛtto vā dhanair vā parivarjitāḥ* / *strīṇām āryasvabhāvanām paramam daivatam patiḥ* // Sdhp.25r.1–2 (Rām.) < Rām.II.109.24. Cf. Manu V.154.

3. *viditām tu mamāpy etad yathā nāryāḥ patir guruḥ* // Sdhp.25r.5 (Rām.) < Rām.II.110.2b.

4. *saṃgrāhe* // *bāhyād āyāntam ālokyā tvaṛitā ca jalāśanaiḥ* / *tāmbūlavayajanaiḥ caiva pādasamvāhanādibhiḥ* // *tathaiva cāṭuvacanaiḥ khedasamnodanaiḥ paraiḥ* / *yā priyam prīṇayet prītyā trilokī prīṇitā tayā* // Sdhp.25r.7–9 (*saṃgraha*)? See also Sdhp.31r.7–8 (from section IV, pp.280–1) < Mbh. III.223.6.

5. *mitam dadāti hi pitā mitam bhrātā mitam sutah* / *amitasya hi dātāram bhartāram kā na pūjayet* // Sdhp.25r.9–10 (*saṃgraha*) < Subh.378/4 (*śocati* for *pūjayet*); Mbh.XII.145.6 (*mātā* for *bhrātā* preferred reading; twenty-one MSS read *bhrātā* incl. one MS from the TMSSM library); Sk.P.III.2.7. 47c–MSS read *bhrātā* incl. one MS from the TMSSM library); Sk.P.III.2.7. 47c–48a (*sutam sutah* for *mitam sutah*). See also Sdhp.53v.9–10, from section V.

section remains in effect a continuation of the earlier one on general behaviour. Three *ślokas* in particular are worth recounting here, all of them unattributed by Tryambaka.

'These are the six things that corrupt women (*nārīṇām dūṣaṇāni ṣaṭ*): drinking; keeping bad company; deserting one's husband (glossed by Tryambaka as "sleeping in the house of someone other than one's husband"); roaming around (on one's own); sleeping (glossed by Tryambaka as "sleeping in the daytime"); and staying (i.e. spending time) in other people's homes.'⁶ Some of the aspects involved in 'keeping bad company' — that is, the men and women with whom the good Hindu wife may not properly associate — are discussed in section IIC, pp.170–6). Since it is deemed necessary to begin each day by meditating with one's husband (see section IIA, pp.52–4), it makes sense that the conscientious wife never spends the night away from him. The question of whether or not she may sleep in the hottest part of the day after the midday meal is discussed briefly on page 49.

'These are the six things that cause women and *sūdras* to fall (*strīsūdrapātānāni ṣaṭ*): recitation (or repetition, i.e. of sacred texts; *japa* [*h*]); austerities (*tapas*); going on pilgrimages; renunciation (*pravrajyā*); the chanting of mantras (*mantrasādhanam*); and the worship of deities (*devatārādhnam*).'⁷ To this *śloka* we may add a similar one taken from section V, and attributed there to Āśvalāyana. '*Sūdras* are enjoined by Brahmā to serve the twice-born always, and likewise women to serve their own husbands. Women who are devoted to their husbands should never engage in *japa* recitation, austerities (*tapas*), offerings into fire (*homa*), religious donations (*dāna*), or any other religious observance (or vow; *vrata*) or ritual (*makha*), as long as their husbands are alive.'⁸ The important implications of these *ślokas* have been discussed in the

6. *atha varjanīyāḥ* // Sdhp.25r.10. *pānam durjanasamsargah patyā ca viraho 'tanam* / *svapno 'nyagehavasās ca nārīṇām dūṣaṇāni ṣaṭ* // Sdhp.25r.10–11 < Manu IX.13 (*nārīṇām dūṣaṇāni* for *nārīṇām dūṣaṇāni*). *patyā virahaḥ pati-grhā* [d] *grhāntaraśayanam* // *svapn[o] divāsvāpāḥ* // Sdhp.25r.11.

7. *japas tapas tīrthayātrā pravrajyā mantrasādhanam* / *devatārādhnam ceti strīsūdrapātānāni ṣaṭ* // Sdhp.25v.1 < Atri 135b–136a (*caiva* for *ceti*); Sm.M.I.p.158 (*tīrthasevā* for *tīrthayātrā*; *caiva* for *ceti*; Atri); Sm.M.II.p.390. See also Sdhp.59r.2–3, from section V (*caiva* for *ceti*; Manu).

8. *āśvalāyano 'pi* // Sdhp.58r.2. *sūdrāṇām dvijaśuśrūṣā vihītā brahmaṇā yathā* / *strīṇām svabhartṛśuśrūṣā tathaiva vihītā sadā* // *na syāj japas tapo hom[o] dānavratamakhādikam* / *strīṇām patiparāṇām tu patyau jīvati kiñ cana* // Sdhp.58r.3–5 (Āśv.), from section V < ?

relevant sections. For example, the recitation of mantras (*japa*, *mantrasādhana*) is dealt with in the sections on *devatādhyānam* (IIA, pp.52–4), *gomatimantra* (pp.67–9), *snānam* (pp.82–8), *sam-dhyā* (IIB, pp.105–7), *arghyadānam* (pp.149–55), *devapūja* (IIC, pp.178–80), *vaiśvadeva* (pp.180–3), and *strīsvabhāva* (III, pp.246–72). Going on pilgrimages (*tīrthayātra*) is discussed in section IIB (pp.132–41); renunciation (*pravrajyā*) in the section on *parapuruṣa* (pp.170–6); the worship of deities (*devatārādhanam*) in the sections on *devatādhyānam* (pp.52–4), the goddess Śrī (pp.60–3), *devapūjā* (pp.178–80), *vaiśvadeva* (180–3) and the goddess Jyeṣṭhā (pp.227–9). Offerings into the fire (*homa*) are described in section IIB (pp.102–7, *homa*; and pp.107–15, the role of the wife); religious donations (*dāna*) in the sections on managing the household accounts (pp.168–70) and *strīdhanam* (IV, pp.277–80); religious vows or observances (*vrata*) in the sections on the role of the wife (IIB, pp.107–15) and *strīsvabhāva* (III, pp.246–72). The exclusion of women from Vedic education and ritual sacrifice in general is discussed in sections I (pp.34–9) and IIB (pp.107–15). The assertion that, for women, household duties are the equivalent of performing the sacrifice is considered in the sections on daily duties (*strīṇām āhnikam*, pp.44–50) and household tasks (IIC, pp.168–76); and the idea that serving one's husband is the equivalent of the Vedic student serving his *guru* in the section on paying obeisance to the husband (IIC, pp.162–3). The question of what religious practices are open to a woman after her husband has died is discussed in the sections on *sahagamanavidhi* (IV, pp.291–8) and *vidhavādharmaḥ* (IV, pp.298–304). Lastly, 'nothing should be done independently (*svātantryeṇa*) by a woman, either as a child, a young girl or an old woman, even in her (own) home.'⁹ For, as Manu himself explains in the crucial following verses (omitted here by Tryambaka), she should be subject to her father in childhood, to her husband in her married life, and to her sons in widowhood (Manu V.148; see section IV, pp.299–300). The rest of this brief section is predictable.

Women's property (strīdhanam; Sdhp.25v.6–27r.4)

Some aspects of this topic are discussed briefly in the approp-

9. *bālayā vā yuvatyā vā vṛddhayā vāpi yoṣitā / na svātantryeṇa kartavyam kāryam kimcid grheṣv api* // Sdhp.25v.4–5 < Manu V.147; Sm.M.1.p.157

riate sections. Most important, perhaps, is the notion that the possession of property is a necessary prerequisite for the performance of sacrifice; and thus that the ineligibility of women to own anything (since they themselves are 'owned'; see note 10) means that they have no right to perform sacrifice (see section I). In addition to this, the question of whether or not a wife may earn money is raised in section IIB (pp.132–41); the wife's responsibility to manage the household accounts in section IIC (pp.168–70); her right to make religious donations (*dāna*) in sections IIC (pp.168–70) and IV (pp.274–6). But such passages merely touch on what is an extremely complex topic pursued in great detail in numerous commentaries and digests. The problem here is how one may reconcile apparently conflicting rulings. Briefly, Tryambaka proceeds as follows.

On the one hand, there are a number of rulings that deny women the rights of ownership, inheritance and the independent disposal of property. According to an unattributed quotation (in fact taken from Manu), for example, 'these three—a wife, a son and a slave—are held to be without property (*[a]dhanāḥ*): whatever they acquire (or earn) is the property of him to whom they belong.'¹⁰ According to *śruti*, women are powerless (*nirindriyā*) and without inheritance (*adāyādih*; Sdhp.25v.7–8). According to another quotation from Manu (attributed here to Kātyāyana), 'women should not set aside anything (for their own use) from the property of the joint family or even from their own property (*svakād api ca vittād*) without the permission of their husbands.'¹¹ Regarding a woman's lack of independence in such matters (*tatra svātantryābhāve*), Tryambaka quotes Hārīta. 'A woman is not entitled to independence (*na strī svātantryam arhati*) with regard to giving (*dāne*) or throwing (*dhamane*; lit. 'blowing' things) away, or with regard to any particular religious matter, or with regard to taking (*ādāne*; i.e.

(Manu); Sm.C.III.ii.p.584 (Manu); Subh.366/15 (*kimcid kāryam for kāryam kimcid*).

10. *bhāryā putras ca dāsas ca traya ete 'dhanāḥ smṛtaḥ / yat te samadhi-gacchanti yasyaite tasya tau' dhanam* // Sdhp.25v.6–7 < Manu VIII.416 (*evādhanāḥ for ete 'dhanāḥ; yasya te for yasyai te*). See also Sdhp.26[1]r.8–9; 26[1]v.3–4.

11. *na nirhāram striyaḥ kuryuḥ kuṭumbād bahumadhyagāt / svakād api ca vittād dhi svasya bhartur anājñayā* // Sdhp.26r.9–10 (Kāty.) < Manu IX.199. See also Sdhp.25v.5–6, from section IV, pp.274–6; Sdhp.26[1]r.4 (Yājñ.).

something for her own use) or disposing (*visarge*; i.e. of things in general).¹²

On the other hand, according to another quotation attributed to Manu, there are six kinds of 'women's property'. 'That which is given (to her) in the vicinity of the fire (at the marriage ceremony); that which is (given to her) when (she is) taken to her new husband's home; that which (is given to her by her husband) in the act of love; and that which (is given to her) by her mother, brother and father—these are known as the sixfold property of women (*ṣaḍvidham strīdhanam*).'¹³ (For the application of the term *strīdhanam* to property acquired by the husband from the wife's family at the time of marriage, i.e. dowry, see Derrett 1984:185.) Tryambaka also points out that, according to Āpastamba, 'If the wife makes an occasional religious donation (*naimittike dāne*) when her husband is away, this is not called "theft".'¹⁴ Similarly, the epics frequently show women (such as Kausalyā) who are described elsewhere as virtuous and yet who make donations apparently in their own right.

Tryambaka's conclusion follows Rāghavānanda's comment on Manu VIII.416 (quoted above, see note 10). The so-called 'independence' of the wife, like that of the slave, is no independence at all. For the wife's right to her property implies the ownership of her husband too ((*bhāryādhanam bhartur api svāmitvāvagamāt*; Sdhp.26 [1]v.2–3). What then is the difference between a wife's 'own property' and that which is common to both wife and husband? With regard to the distribution of property owned jointly by the two of them, the wife needs her husband's permission but he does not need hers. With regard to the sixfold *strīdhanam*, however, the right of ownership is all hers; but she still needs her husband's permission to exercise it.

12. *tatra svātantryābhāve hārītaḥ || dāne vā dhamane(?) vā 'pi dharmārthe vā viśesataḥ || ādāne vā visarge vā na strī svātantryam arhati || iti ||* Sdhp.26 [1]2–3 (Since MS T₁ is hard to decipher, I have followed the reading *dāne vā dhamane vā 'pi* of MSS T₂ and T₃; i.e. in preference to the readings *dāne vā dhamam ne vā 'pi* of MS M and *dāne bādhamate vā 'pi* of PT)? Cf. Manu IX.3.

13. *tad āha manuḥ || adhyagny adhyāv[ā]hanikam dattam ca prītikarmani / mātṛbhrātṛprāptam ṣaḍvidham strīdhanam smṛtam || iti ||* Sdp.25v.9–10 (Manu) < Manu IX.194. See also Sdhp.26v.6; Sdhp.26[1]r.6–7.

14. *āpastambo 'pi || na hi bhartṛvipravāse naimittike dāne steyam upadiśanti || iti ||* Sdhp.2–3 (Āp.) < ?

For his part, he may use her property only if he has her permission. Indeed, as Tryambaka explains, 'a husband should never seize (control of) his wife's property as long as she is alive; if he does so by force (*balāt*), he should be punished by the king.'¹⁵ The quotation that follows—attributed to Mādhava—extends the ruling to a woman's other male relatives. 'Neither husband, son, father nor brother has the power to take or dispose of a woman's property (*strīdhanam*); if any one of them makes use of (lit. "enjoys") a woman's property without her permission (lit. "by force"), he should be made to give it back with interest (*savṛddhikam*) and he should incur punishment (*daṇḍam*; e.g. a fine).'^{16, 17}

15. *strīdhanam tasyām jīvavatyām bhartrā na grāhyam balāt grahaṇe rājñā daṇḍya ity āha mādhavah ||* Sdhp.26[2]r.2–3.

16. *na bhartā naiva ca suto na pitā bhrātaro na ca / ādāne vā visarge vā strīdhanam prabhaviṣṇavaḥ || yadi tv ekataro 'py eṣaṁ strīdhanam bhakṣayed balāt / savṛddhikam pradāpyaḥ syād daṇḍam caiva samāpnuyāt || iti ||* Sdhp.26[2]r.3–5 (Mādhava) < Dh.kośa I.ii.p.1458 (*hy ekataro for tv ekataro*; *savṛddhim pradiḍāpyaḥ for savṛddhikam pradāpyaḥ*; Kāty.).

17. This important ruling was quoted in a recent judgement of the Indian Supreme Court hailed by the media as 'an unequivocal victory' for women's rights and 'a major break-through in dowry disputes'. Sunil Sethi's article, published in *India Today* in April 1985, opens with the following. 'For some time now the Supreme Court has acquired a healthy reputation for passing judgements heavily weighted in favour of women's rights. Last fortnight that reputation was amply reinforced when the court passed a landmark judgement declaring that all gifts made over to a woman at the time of her marriage remained her absolute private property till the end; and that her husband, or any other, had no right to them without her sanction. . . . But the Supreme Court, in fact, was upholding the right of a woman to retain nuptial gifts as enshrined in the ancient concept of *strīdhan* (woman's wealth) first mooted by the Vedic sage Manu. Quoting from classical treatises on Hindu law, the 25-page judgement . . . noted that "neither the husband, nor the son, nor the father, nor the brother, has power to use or to alienate the legal property of a woman. And if any of them shall consume such property against her own consent he shall be compelled to pay its value with interest to her. . . .". . . In other words, gifts of cash, ornaments, silver, clothing — or anything that constitutes dowry — may be entrusted by the wife to the husband to keep but he would be deemed "guilty of criminal breach of trust" if he either misappropriates or refuses to return what the court regards "as the absolute and personal property of his wife".' (Sethi 1985:57.)

Tryambaka explains that when the epics describe virtuous women such as Kausalyā or Sitā giving things away, the permission of their husbands is assumed. For without the husband's permission (*bhartur ājñām vinā*), the wife should not give anything away, even to her own relatives (*naiva svabandhubhyo diśed dhanam*; Sdhp.27r.2-3).

In praise of the pativrata (Sdhp.27r.4-33v.8)

This section consists almost entirely of quotations, including lengthy passages quoted verbatim from the *Mahābhārata* and the *Agnipurāṇa*. Many of the individual rulings are also given earlier in the relevant contexts. In this section, apart from the theme of the proper behaviour of wives, there is virtually no thread of argument.

The first series of *śloka*s are attributed to 'other *smṛti* texts' (Sdhp.27r.5-27v.4; *smṛtyantaram*), the second to the *Agnipurāṇa* (Sdhp.27v.4-10). Both merely reinforce points that Tryambaka has made elsewhere.

The third series consists of two entire chapters quoted verbatim from Draupadī's conversation with Satyabhāmā in the *Vana-parvan* of the *Mahābhārata* (Sdhp.27v.10-31v.7 < Mbh.III.222-3). Satyabhāmā asks Draupadī how she has managed to gain such control over her husbands (the five Pāṇḍavas) that they are never angry with her.¹⁸ What is her secret? Is it the result of 'a religious observance (or vow; *vrata*); (the practice of) austerities (*tapas*); bathing (in sacred waters; *snānam*); (reciting) a mantra (or spell); (using) herbs (with magical properties); the (magic) power of knowledge (*vidyāvīryam*); the (magic) power attained by (using special) roots (*mūlavīryam*); *japa* recitation; offerings into the fire (*homa*); or the (tantric rituals described in) *āgama* texts (*āgamā[h]*)'?¹⁹ Draupadī rejects all such methods as appropriate only to wicked women (cf. pp.274-6 above); for drinking the water used to bathe one's husband's feet as the proper alternative to bathing in a sacred place, see section IIB, pp.134-8. 'My husbands have come under my

18. *katham ca vaśagās tubhyam na kupyanti ca te śubhe // tava vaśyā hi satatam pāṇḍavāḥ priyadarśane //* Sdhp.28r.5 (Mbh.) < Mbh.III.222.4c-5a.

19. *vratacaryā tapo vāpi snānamantrausadhāni vā / vidyāvīryam mūlavīryam japahomāgamās tathā //* Sdhp.28r.6-7 (Mbh.) < Mbh.III.222.6 (*japahomas tathāgadāḥ* for *japahomāgamās tathā*).

control,' she explains, 'as a result of my attentiveness, my eternal readiness to serve, and my devoted services to my elders.'²⁰ Draupadī then proceeds to enumerate all the familiar qualities of the *pativrata*. They may be summed up in one *śloka*. 'There is no deity like him — that is, like one's husband — in all the god-filled worlds; when he is pleased, through his grace (*prasādāt*) all desires are fulfilled; when angered, he kills.'²¹

The fourth set of rulings, attributed to the *Agnipurāṇa*, is taken from Kṛṣṇa's advice to his younger sister, Subhadrā, on the eve of her marriage (Sdhp.31v.7-32r.2). His main point is that she should 'forget all about us (i.e. her own family), even her mother and father. For the husband alone is a woman's family; the husband alone is a woman's wealth; the husband alone is a woman's religious duty, and her chief austerity.'²² The importance of forgetting one's own family and never returning to one's father's house is taken up again at some length later in this section (p.288).

The fifth passage is taken, with some omissions, from the conversation between Umā and Mahesvara in the *Anuśāsanaparvan* of the *Mahābhārata* (Sdhp.32r.2-33r.2 < Mbh.XIII.134.32-3, 34b-5, 36b, 38-41, 43, 45-52a, 53-5). It opens with Umā's statement that 'the religious duty of a woman (*strīdharmah*) is created at the outset, that is, at the time of marriage, by her relatives: in the presence of the (marriage) fire, she becomes her husband's partner in the religious sphere (*sahadharma-carī*).'²³ Umā then enumerates the qualities of the ideal wife who 'participates in the religious duty of her husband' (*dharmacārīṇī, dharmabhāginī*), who 'takes his vow

20. *avadhānena subhage nityotthitayaiva ca / bhartāro vaśagā mahyam guruśrūṣayaiva ca //* Sdhp.29v.7-8 (Mbh.) < Mbh.III.222.37 (*itthānatayaiva* for *itthitayaiva*; *śrūṣaṇena* for *śrūṣayaiva*).

21. *naitādrśam daivatam asti satye sarveṣu lokeṣu sadaiva[re]ṣu / yathā patis tuṣyati sarvakāmā labhyāḥ prasādāt kupitā ca hanyāt //* Sdhp.31r.2-3 (Mbh.) < Mbh.III.223.2 (*patis tasya hi* for *patis tuṣyati*; *prasāde* for *prasādāt*). Cf. note 24.

22. *mātaram pītarām vāpi māmān smara kadācana // patir eva strī[ā] bandhubh[ā] patir eva strī[ā] dhanam / patir eva strī[ā] dharmah patir eva mahat-tapah /* Sdhp.32r.1-2 (Ag.P.) < ?

23. *strīdharmah pūrvam evāyam vivāhe bandhubhiḥ kṛtāḥ / sahadharma-carī bhartur bhavaty agnisamīpataḥ //* Sdhp.32r.3-4 (Mbh.) < Mbh.XIII.134.32 (*pūrvā evāyam* for *pūrvam evāyam*). Cf. section I, notes 15, 16 (Manu II.67).

as her own' (*pativratā*, *pativratābhāginī*; see pp.50, 107–15 etc.). Above all, 'the good woman always regards her husband as a god . . . For the husband is god for women; the husband is family; the husband is the goal. There is no goal, no deity like the husband.'²⁴

Umā also touches on what is a new theme for Tryambaka. 'If for some reason a husband tells (his wife to do) something that is (normally) not to be done (*akāryam*), something that is against *dharma* (*adharmam*), or something that causes death (*prāṇanāśanam*), then—even if he is poor or sick or in trouble or in the midst of enemies, even if he is suffering from a brahmin's curse (e.g. Pāṇḍu; see section V, pp.309–10)—she should do it without hesitation, bearing in mind the (special) duties (enjoined) for difficult times (*āpaddharmān*).'²⁵ Tryambaka returns to this important issue in his conclusion.

The final extended quotation is taken, with few omissions, from Bhīṣma's conversation with Yudhiṣṭhira on the behaviour of good women in the *Anuśāsanaparvan* of the *Mahābhārata* (Sdhp. 33r.2–33v.8 < Mbh.XIII.12.1–3a, 6b–21; see also section III, pp. 247–8, 268). Bhīṣma in turn recalls another conversation: that between Sumanā and Śāṇḍilī, the renowned *pativratā*, when the two women meet in heaven (*devaloka*). Asked what meritorious behaviour has brought her there, Śāṇḍilī stresses that 'it was not by wearing the ochre robe (*kaṣāya*; i.e. of the renunciate), the bark garments (*valkala*; i.e. of the hermit), the shaven head (*muṇḍā*; i.e. of certain types of religious mendicants, or the widow), or the matted locks (*jaṭilā*; i.e. of the ascetic) that [she] became a deity (i.e. entitled to be in *devaloka*).'²⁶ She simply followed the dictates of her religious duty to her husband (*patidharma*; Sdhp.33v.7 < Mbh.XIII.124.21). Tryambaka's repeated insistence that the good wife should

24. *devavat satatam sādhvī bhartāraṃ pratipaśyati // patir hi devo nārīnām patir bandhuḥ patir gatih / patyā samā gatir nāsti daivatam vā yathā patih //* Sdhp.32r.5–6, 32v.8–9 (Mbh.) < Mbh.XIII.134.34b,51 (*yā bhartāraṃ pra-paśyati for bhartāraṃ pratipaśyati*). Cf. Subh.p.366, *satīvarṇanam* 14.

25. *yady akāryam adharmam vā yadi vā prāṇanāśanam / patir brūyād daridro vā vyādhito vā katham cana // āpanno ripusaṃstho vā brahmaśāpār-dito 'pi va / āpaddharmān anuprekṣya tat kāryam aviśāṅkayā //* Sdhp.32v.9–33r.1 < Mbh.XIII.134.53–4.

26. *nāham kāṣāyavasānā nāsmi valkaladhārīnī / na ca muṇḍā na jaṭilā bhuktvā devatvam āgatā //* Sdhp.33r.6–7 (Mbh.) < Mbh.XIII.124.8 (*nāpi for nāsmi*).

have nothing to do with female renouncers, mendicants or ascetics is discussed in more detail in section IIC (pp.170–6). The question of whether or not the widow should shave her head is dealt with below (pp.303–4).

The religious duties of the menstruating woman (*rajasvalādharmāḥ*; Sdhp. 33v.8–40r.3)

This is a somewhat loosely structured section that touches on most of the points normally made concerning the menstruating woman. She herself is referred to in a variety of ways that reflect the range of implications usually associated with her condition. For example, she is described as 'full of impurity' (*rajasvalā*); 'one whose clothes are stained' (*malavadvāsas*); 'overflowing with menstrual blood' (*ārtavābhiplutā*); 'bearing flowers' or 'in bloom' (*puspinī*, *puspa-vatī*); 'one who has the duty or condition of women' (*strīdharmīnī*); and so on.

The first and most important point that Tryambaka makes is that 'the menstruating woman is impure for three (days and) nights.'²⁷ In a later passage, he produces a famous quotation, attributed to the [*Smṛti*]-*saṃgraha*. 'On the first day, she is declared to be (as polluting as) an untouchable; on the second, (as polluting as) a brahmin-killer; on the third, (as polluting as) a washerwoman; on the fourth day, she is purified.'²⁸ The significance of this impurity, and the traditional tracing of its origins to the story of Indra's brahminicide, are discussed in section III. For the symbolic 'menstrual pollution' of rivers and the earth, see Salomon 1984:157–8, 173–5.

In this section, Tryambaka uses a quotation attributed to the *Smṛticandrikā* to explain that the menstruating woman loses two kinds of blood, one far more polluting than the other. 'That which occurs to women at the wrong time (i.e. outside the crucial three days described above) men call "blood" (*raktam*); that which occurs at the

27. *atha rajasvalādharmāḥ //* Sdhp.33v.8. *tatra vasiṣṭhaḥ // trirātram rajasvalā rajasvalāśucir bhavati //* Sdhp.33v.8–9 (Vas.) < Vas.V.6; Dh.kośa I.iii.1.iii.p.1977.

28. *prathame 'hani caṇḍālī dvitīye brahmaghātakī / tritīye rajakī proktā caturthe 'hani śudhyati //* Sdhp.36r.2–3 (incl. insert above; *Samgraha*) < Par.Sm.VII.18 (*brahmaghātīnī for 'ghātakī*).

right time (i.e. within those three days) is called "menstrual blood" (*rajas*); as a result of the latter alone, she becomes impure. For women (who continue to bleed from the fourth) until the twelfth day, the purification (appropriate) for urine is required; a ritual bath is (prescribed for those who bleed from the twelfth) until the eighteenth day; after that, she is (again) impure for three days (i.e. it is assumed that another cycle has begun).²⁹ Another quotation, attributed to Āṅgiras, provides a more detailed definition. 'The best of wise men know that the menstruation (*rajas*) of women is of four kinds: that which is due to illness (*rogajam*); that which is due to (a disturbance of) the emotions (*rāgajam*); that which is due to (an imbalance of) the humours (*dhātujam*); and that which occurs at the right time (of the monthly cycle; i.e. during the crucial three days).³⁰ Both Āṅgiras and Tryambaka conclude that only the fourth type of bleeding makes a woman ritually impure (*āsuddhā*; Sdhp.35v.5). One can only speculate on the reasons behind this careful categorization of the polluting powers of menstrual fluid: the importance of establishing a pregnancy certainly (see below, pp.287–8); a desire to take the initiative out of the hands of woman perhaps; or merely an obsession with classification.

Secondly, there are innumerable prohibitions relating to the menstruating woman (Sdhp.33v.9–34r.4). For example, she should not use collyrium for her eyes (cf. section IIA, pp.96–101), comb her hair (cf. section IIA, pp.96–7), massage her body with oil or ointments (cf. sections IIA, pp.96–7, and IID, pp.236–45, or take a bath (cf. section IIA, pp.82–8). She should not clean her teeth (cf. section IIA, pp.78–82), or cut her nails. She should not 'touch fire' (*nāgnim spr̥ṣet*, i.e. cook; cf. sections IIA, pp.100–1, and IIC, pp.198–205). She should eat only those foods which are fit for sacrifice (*haviṣyam*; cf. Dh.kośa III.ii.1180, 1216, 1265, 1270–3, 1287–8 etc.; PVK II.i. p.681) and she should use either her own cupped hands (*añjalīnā vā pibet*; i.e. like a renouncer, cf. *pāṇi-pātrin*, *kārapātrin*, Yatidh.32.85; Olivelle 1977:37, 164–8) or a

29. *tathā candrikāyām // akāle yad bhavet strīṇām raktam āhur manī-
ṣiṇaḥ / kāle tu yad rajaḥ proktaṁ tasmāt tatraiva sāsuciḥ // ā dvādaśāhām
nārīnām mūtrava[c] chaucam iṣyate / āṣṭādaśāhā[t] snānam syāt trirātram
parato 'suciḥ // Sdhp.35v.6–9 (Sm.C) < ?*

30. *yadāhāṅgirāḥ // rajaś caturvidham jñeyam rogajam rāgajam tathā /
dhātujam kālajam ceti yoṣitām tu budhottamāḥ // Sdhp.35v.3–4 (Āṅg.) < ?*

copper or iron vessel (or, according to some authorities, an unbaked earthenware vessel or one made of leaves; see section IIC, pp.217–21). She should certainly not eat food from her husband's plate (*patipātre 'nnam*; cf. *ucchiṣṭa*, section IIC, pp.221–7). She should not even look at her husband (*paśyed api patim na ca*). She should not sleep on a high bed (cf. section IID, pp.239–40). She should not spin thread, plait or cut rope, or dig in the earth. She should not cry, laugh, talk a great deal, hear loud noises, run, roam about, exert herself, sleep in the daytime, sit in a draught; and so on and so forth.

These prohibitions are frequently coupled with the defects accruing to her child if she disobeys. In most instances, the link between action and defect is clear. For example, if she uses collyrium, her child will be blind in one or both eyes; if she combs her hair, he will be bald. If she massages her body with oil, he will have a skin disease (*duṣcarmā*); if she takes a bath, he will die by drowning (*apsu mārukaḥ*). If she cleans her teeth, his teeth will be discoloured; if she cuts her nails, his nails will be diseased. Similarly, if she plaits rope, her child will hang himself (*udbandhanamṛtaḥ*). If she laughs, his palate, teeth, lips and tongue will be discoloured. If she talks a great deal, he will be a chatterbox (*pralāpī*); if she hears a loud noise, he will be deaf. If she runs, he will be unstable (*cañcalaḥ*); if she roams about, he will be insane (*unmattaḥ*). If she sleeps in the daytime, he will be sleepy by nature.

However, some of the links are less obvious. For example, if she drinks out of an earthenware vessel (*kharva*, *śarāva*), her child will be a dwarf (*kharva*, *vāmana*; a pun). If she eats food from her husband's plate, her child will be insane (*unmādī*). If she spins (*kr̥ṇattī*), or cuts rope, he will be impotent (*kl̥ībhaḥ*; or perhaps of indeterminate sex); a possible allusion to spinning or cutting the 'thread' of progeny that a man is duty bound to continue (*kulatantu*; *saṁtanārtham*, Manu IX.96; etc.). If she digs in the earth, he will be bald or his life will be short. If she sits in a draught, he will be insane (*unmattaḥ*). Most important of all, if a menstruating woman makes love during the crucial three days, her child will be an untouchable (*caṇḍālaḥ*) or cursed (*abhiśastah*; i.e. condemned for committing a *mahāpātaka*). Hence the detailed prohibitions to ensure that the menstruating woman is neither available nor attractive to her husband at this time (cf. section IIA, pp.88–96 and 96–101).

Thirdly, there are a number of special rulings to deal with different

kinds of coincidences. For example, while there is a prohibition on bathing in general (*snānamātranīṣedhe 'pi*) during menstruation, the ritual bath prescribed for a specific occasion (*naimittikaṁ snānam*; see section IIA, pp.82–3) must still be performed, but in some other way. (The menstruating woman should somehow sprinkle her body with water without getting her clothes wet; Sdhp.35r.4–7.) Similarly, what additional rite of expiation (*prāyaścitta*) should be performed by a menstruating woman who is further polluted by contact with an untouchable (*caṇḍāla*, *śvapāka*), an inferior *sūdra* (*antya*, *antyaḥ*; i.e. the lower-caste or untouchable *sūdra*), an outcaste (*patita*, i.e. one guilty of a *mahāpātaka*), a dog or a crow (the *caṇḍālas* of the animal and bird kingdoms) (The answer depends both on which day the contact occurred and on whether she was eating at the time; Sdhp.36v.2–7.) What should a woman do if she begins to menstruate when she is already in a state of impurity due to a birth or a death in the family? (She should have water poured on her head by a brahmin; Sdhp.36v.7–9.) What should she do if, while menstruating herself, she touches or is touched by another menstruating woman? (The answer depends on the *varṇa* of the two women involved, who is responsible for making contact, and whether that contact was intentional or prolonged; Sdhp.36v.9–37r.10.)

Fourthly, there are the rulings for the ritual bath of purification on the fourth day (Sdhp.36r.1–36v.1, 37r.10–37v.7). Towards the end of the morning (*saṁgave*; see p.45) on the fourth day, she should cleanse herself with sixty lumps of earth; if she is a widow, with twice that number (cf. section IIA, pp.71–4). Then she should clean her teeth (cf. section IIA, pp.78–82), and take a ritual bath with her clothes on (*sacelam*; cf. section IIA, pp.82–8). Pure once more, she should gaze at the sun (*bhāskaram dṛṣṭvā*), pray for a son (*putram prārthya*), and attend to her woman's duties (*strī-dharmam . . . samācāret*). According to a quotation attributed to Atri, 'when she has bathed properly, she should look at her husband's face and no one else's, or (if he is away) she should look at the sun while meditating on her husband in her mind.'³¹ That evening, she should make sexual advances to her husband (*upasarpati*; Sdhp.40r.1). A quotation attributed to the Agni-

31. *atriḥ* / Sdhp.37r.10. *susnātā bhartṛvadanam iṣate 'nyasya na kvacit / athavā manasā dhyātvā patim bhānum vilokayet* // Sdhp.37v.3–4 (Atri) < Sk.P.III.2.7.27b-c (*iṣatānyasa* for *iṣate 'nyasya*; *manasī* for *manasā*).

purāṇa is more explicit. 'Anointed with unguents of ground turmeric (*haridrā*) and saffron (*kuṅkuma*; cf. section IIA, pp.96–101), wearing bright garments, thinking of her husband's "lotus foot" (*patipādābjaṁ*; i.e. with the reverence due to one's *guru* or god; cf. sections IIC, pp.156–68, 221–7, and IID, pp.236–45), gazing at her own toes (i.e. keeping her eyes down), not looking at other men, thinking only of her husband, thinking of him as light itself (*bhargam eva*), always (keeping herself) pure (i.e. by taking care not to touch anything polluting), beautifully dressed and ornamented (*bhūṣitā*) and anointed with perfume (cf. section IIA, pp.88–101), and in good spirits (*sumanāḥ*), she should go to bed (see section IID, pp.236–45).'³² If bleeding continues after the fourth day, she is considered 'fit to be touched' (*sparsayogyā*; Sdhp.36r.8) and therefore pure with regard to her husband (*śuddhā bhartu[ḥ]*; Sdhp.36r.5); that is, she should still make love to him. Until her menstrual flow has ceased altogether, however, she is not held to be 'of pure conduct' (*sādhvācārā*; Sdhp.36r.6) and therefore she is not 'fit to perform the ritual worship of the gods and so on' (*daivādikarmayog[ā]*; Sdhp.36r.7–8).

Finally, there are the rulings concerning the importance of making love at the proper time (*rtukāladharma*) and the penalties or atonements (*prāyaścitta*) enjoined for both husband and wife if they fail to take advantage of this opportunity to conceive (Sdhp.37v.7–38r.5, 39v.10–40r.3; cf. *nagnikā*, section IIA, pp.86–8). The penalties described are in fact those normally advocated for adultery. Āpastamba provides an example. 'A man who fails in his duty to his wife should put on the skin of a donkey with the hair turned outwards and go to seven houses calling (out to each in turn): "(Give) alms to a man who has failed in his duty to his wife!" And this should be his livelihood for six months.'³³ A variety of penalties may be imposed on the wife who refuses to make love; and again these are penalties mainly associated with adultery (cf. section III).

32. *āgneyapurāṇe 'pi* // Sdhp.37v.4. *haridrākuṅkumālepalepitā śubhra-vastrakā* // *smarantī patipādābjaṁ svapādāṅguṣṭhaviṣṭā* // *itarāṁs tu na paśyanti smaranti patim eva sū* // *bhartāram bhargam eveti dhyāyanti satatam śuciḥ* // *sumanāḥ śayanam gacched bhūṣitā gandhacarcitā* // *iti* // Sdhp.37v.5–7 (Ag.P.) < ?

33. . . . *āpastambah* // *dāravatikramī kharājinaṁ bahirloma paridhāya dāravatikramiṇe bhikṣām iti saptāgārāni caret / sā vṛtitiḥ ṣaṇmāsān* // Sdhp.37v.7–9 (Ap.) < Ap.I.10.28.19.

According to Āpastamba, she should perform the severe twelve-day *kṛcchra* penance (see Manu XI.211; Vas.23.43; PVK IV.p.132,145) for six months (Sdhp.37v.9–10 < Āp.I.10.28.20). According to the *Brahmāṇḍapurāṇa*, she should be abandoned (*parityājyā*; Sdhp.38r.3–4). According to Manu, 'the king should have her devoured by dogs in a (public) place where many people have gathered (to watch).'³⁴ In her next life, according to an unattributed quotation, she will be reborn as a bitch, a she-wolf, a female jackal or a female hog (Sdhp.39v.10–40r.1; for the retention of gender in transmigration, see sections IIC, p.226, and III, pp.246–7). According to Baudhāyana, her husband should proclaim her publicly to be a foetus-killer (*bhrūnaghñim*; cf. section IIC, pp.217–21) and drive her out of his house (Sdhp.38r.4–5 < Baudh.IV.1.22; Dh.kośa I.ii.1019).

Tryambaka interprets this last ruling to mean that she should be sent back to her father. He then devotes considerable space to proving that the good wife never returns to her father's house (Sdhp.38r.5–39v.10). His evidence includes lengthy quotations taken from the R̥gvedic marriage hymn (R.V.X.85 and commentary), the *Yajurveda* (and commentary), the *Drāhyāyanaśrautasūtra* (and commentary), and the Śakuntalā story from both the *Mahābhārata* and Kālidāsa. The conclusion is clear. 'People suspect a married woman who spends time with her own relations and, even if she is chaste, (they assume) otherwise; that is why (even) her own relatives insist that she remain near her husband, even if he does not like her.'³⁵ As Kaṇva explains to Śakuntalā, 'even slavery (*dāsyam api*) in your husband's house is right (*kṣamam*)' (Sdhp.39v.8 *Abhijñānaśakuntalam* V.27).

The religious duties of the pregnant woman (garbhīṇīdharmāḥ; Sdhp.40r.3–42r.1)

First, Tryambaka gives a number of rulings, largely prohibitions,

34. *manuḥ || bhartāraṃ laṅghayed yā tu jātu strī guṇadarpitā | tām śvabhīḥ khādayed rājā samsthāne bahusamsthite ||* Sdhp.38r.2–3 (Manu) < Manu VIII.371 (*strī jñāti** for *jātu strī*). Cf. Gaut.XXIII.14; Viṣ.Sm.V.18.1.

35. *ayam arthaḥ kālidāsenābhyuktaḥ ||* Sdhp.39r.4–5. *satīm api jñātikulai-kasamśrayām jano 'nyathā bhartrmatīm viśankate | atah samīpe pariṇetur iṣyate tad aprīyāpi pramadā svabandhubhīḥ ||* Sdhp.39v.8–9 (Kālidāsa) < *Abhijñānaśakuntalam* V.17.

relating to the proper behaviour of the pregnant woman. Many of them are given elsewhere in the more general context of the good wife. For example, even if the pregnant woman—who is naturally tired at this time as a result of the weight of the unborn child (*garbhabharālasāyāḥ svabhāvataḥ*)—abandons all other ornamentation, she should not abandon those things which are associated with the woman whose husband is still alive: that is, *haridrā*, collyrium and so on (Sdhp.41r.4–7; cf. section IIA, p.96, note 73). Similarly, she should perform the popular *naktavrata* that involves a morning bath, a *pūjā* to Pārvaṭī (the model of the devoted wife; see section I), and eating only at night (Sdhp.40v.2).

Some rulings are more specific to pregnancy. For example, the pregnant woman should avoid such things as riding elephants and horses, climbing hills or onto housetops (*kuñjarāśvādiśaīlaharmyādi-rohanam*), strenuous physical exertion (*vyāyāmaṃ*), walking fast (*śīghragamanam*), riding in a cart (*śakaṭārohanam*), blood-letting (*raktavimokṣam*), and so on (Sdhp.40v.3–5). If she obeys these rules, she will have a son who lives for a long time and is very wealthy (*putraḥ sthirāyur vṛddhisamyutaḥ*); if she does not, she will cause a miscarriage (*garbhapatanaṃ avāpnoti*; Sdhp.40v.6–7). The ruling that a pregnant woman should avoid sexual intercourse (. . . *vyavāyam ca garbhīṇī varjayet sadā*; Sdhp.41r.3–4) is somewhat at odds with the widespread idea that—due to the boon granted to women by Indra when they agreed to take on part of the guilt of his brahminicide (see section III, pp.250–1)—if a woman wants to make love, her husband should not refuse, right up to the delivery of her child (Yājñ.I.81, Mit.; Tait.Sam.II.5.1.4–5; etc.).

Secondly, Tryambaka deals with the importance of indulging a pregnant woman's cravings (*dohadapradānam*; Sdhp.41r.9). He quotes Yājñavalkya. 'As a (direct) result of not indulging the craving of a pregnant woman, the foetus acquires some defect (*doṣam*); that is, some deformity (*vairūpyam*) or even death. That is why what women desire (when they are pregnant) should be done.'³⁶ Even if she wants something that is bad (*ahitam*) for her, she should

36. *dohadapradānam yājñavalkye || dohadasyāpradānena garbho doṣam avāpnuyāt | vairūpyam maraṇam vāpi tasmāt kāryam priyam strīyāḥ ||* Sdhp.41r.9–10 < Yājñ.III.79 (*dauhrdasyā** for *dohadasyā**; *dohadasyā** given as variant reading); Dh.kośa I.ii.p.1083.

be given it: a little is in this case good or at least somewhat good (*hitopahitam alpakam*, Sdhp.41v.3 < *Aṣṭāṅgahrdayam*, *śārīrasthānam* 1.53b; cf. Obeyesekere 1963:340-1). The reasoning behind this—derived here from the medical authority, Vāgbhaṭa—is that the heart is one of the ‘soft’ organs bequeathed by the mother (for the others, see Jolly 1901:81). ‘For (the child’s) heart is born of its mother (*mātrjam*) and is (thus closely) linked with its mother’s heart; it is therefore not right to deny the cravings (*śraddhāvimānanam*) of the pregnant woman.’³⁷ For in indulging the mother, one is in fact indulging the child. The cravings felt by the mother are thus in reality those of the foetus for all that it experienced in its former life (Jolly 1901:77). Medical texts derive *dohada* from *dvaihrdaya*, ‘two-hearted’, on the grounds that the hearts of mother and foetus are linked in this way.

Two points may be made here. First, this close relationship between the hearts of mother and child supports the idea that the half-breed demon priest inherits his mother’s demonic heart (or *svabhāva*; see section III, p.266). Secondly, the *dohada* or craving of the pregnant woman is a recurrent motif in South Asian culture and folklore. More important, it can provide a graphic (but culturally acceptable) expression of a woman’s hostility towards her husband, her ambivalence towards her child, and her resentment regarding the traditional role of women in society (cf. Bloomfield 1920; Tawney 1924:I, appendix III; Obeyesekere 1963).

Finally, Tryambaka describes the entry of the pregnant woman into the lying-in chamber (*sūtikāgāra veśanam*; Sdhp.41v.4-42r.1). She should be led into this special room where all that is necessary has been gathered together (*sambhāraiḥ sambhṛtam*; Sdhp.41v.9; cf. Jolly 1901:82-3) in or before the ninth month, or even at the moment of giving birth (*prasūtisambhave kāle sadyo vāpi*; Sdhp.41v.5), at a suitably auspicious time, and with a ceremony to bring good luck (*kṛtakautukamaṅgalām*; Sdhp.41v.10). Moreover, she should hold in her hand a fruit that has a masculine name (*hastastha-*

37. *bāhaṭe 'pi // mātrjam hy asya hrdayam mātuś ca hrdayena tat / sambandham tena garbhinyā neṣṭam śraddhāvimānanam* // Sdhp.41v.1-2 (Bāhaṭa) < Vāgbhaṭa's *Aṣṭāṅgahrdayam*, *śārīrasthānam* 1.52b-53a (*śraddhāvidhānam* for *śraddhāvimānanam*; the latter variant is read by Arunadatta's commentary). ‘Bāhaṭa’ is the South Indian version of ‘Vāgbhaṭa’.

punnāmaphalām; Sdhp.41v.10) in order to encourage the birth of a son.

The religious duties of the woman whose husband is away
(*proṣitabhartṛkādharmāḥ*; Sdhp.42r.1-3).

This brief section quotes two well-known but here unascribed rulings, without comment. ‘When her husband has gone to another country, the chaste woman (*satī*) should forego perfumes, garlands, collyrium, (using) the teeth-cleaning stick and (chewing) betel.’³⁸ ‘The woman whose husband is away should abandon playing, adorning her body, attending gatherings and festivals, laughing, and going to other people’s houses.’³⁹ Mit. on Yājñ.1.84 glosses ‘playing’ (*krīḍām*) as ‘with a ball and so on’ (*kandukādibhiḥ*), ‘attending festivals’ (*[u]tsavo*) as ‘marriages and so on’ (*vivāhādih*), and ‘laughing’ (*hāsyam*) as ‘with the mouth open’ (*viṣṛmbhanam*). Such are the self-imposed deprivations implied by Draupadī when she tells Satyabhāmā that she always observes a ‘vow’ (*bhavāmi vratacārīṇī*) when her husband(s) is (are) away (Sdhp.29r.9 < Mbh. III.222.29; see section IV, pp.280-1). The implications of the individual items of beautification and personal hygiene have been discussed earlier in the appropriate sections.⁴⁰

The injunction relating to dying (literally ‘going’) with (one’s husband) (*sahagamanavidhiḥ*; Sdhp.42r.3-45r.5)

Of the nine topics discussed in this section on the duties common to all women, this is perhaps the most interesting. For in 1789,

38. *gate deśāntaram patyau gandhamālyāñjanāny api / dantakāṣṭham ca tāmbūlam varjayed vanitā satī* // Sdhp.42r.1-2 < Manu, *pariśiṣṭa*, p.7 (1935 Benares edn.; *Smṛtiratnāvalī*; *āni ca for āny api).

39. *krīḍām śārīrasaṃskāram samājotsavadarśanam / hāsyam paragrhe yānam tyajet proṣitabhartṛkā // iti* // Sdhp.42r.2-3 < Yājñ.1.84; Dh.kośa I.ii.p.1085. Cf. Sm.C.III.ii.p.592-3.

40. For perfumes, garlands etc., see section IIA, pp.96-101; and for teeth-cleaning, pp.78-82; for chewing betel, see sections IIA, pp.96-101 and IIC, pp.229-33. The issue of attending festivals and public gatherings is raised in sections IIB, pp.132-41 (e.g. note 38) and IV, pp.274-6; visiting the homes of others in section IV, p.275, (note 6). Finally, the reasons a man is permitted to leave home are given in section IIB, pp.132-41.

'suttee' was officially noted by the government of Bengal. The campaign against the custom, led by Rammohan Roy (1772–1833), met with considerable hostility from the orthodox community (see Anantarāma's *Sahānumaraṇaviveka*).⁴¹ In 1829, Suttee Regulation XVII made the practice illegal. In 1830, eight hundred Hindu conservatives appealed to the Privy Council on the grounds that the Act interfered with Indian culture and religion. In 1832, the pro-suttee appeal was rejected. In the Maratha court of Thanjavur in the mid-eighteenth century, however, the orthodox position was still maintained. Tryambaka presents it as follows.

He begins with two resounding quotations that advocate the practice of *sahagamana*. First, 'at the time of a girl's wedding, the brahmins should recite (these words): "May you be one who accompanies her husband (always,) when he is alive and even when he is dead!"'⁴² Secondly, according to Sāṅkha, 'if, when her husband has died, a woman ascends with (him; *samārohe[ti]*) into the fire, she is glorified in heaven as one whose conduct is equal to that of Arundhati.'⁴³

Tryambaka next considers the objection (*nanu...*) that *sahagamana* is in fact a form of suicide, and therefore prohibited (*ātma-hatyārūpatvena niṣiddhatvāt*; Sdhp.42r.6–7). Of the two quotations given to support this objection, the first is the standard *pūrvapakṣa* against suicide. 'And therefore one should certainly not depart (this life) before its full length (has been lived out).'⁴⁴ The second is Īś.Up.3, together with the common misinterpretation of the phrase *ātmahano janah* to mean 'people who kill themselves' instead of

41. I am indebted to J. Duncan M. Derrett for drawing my attention to this work.

42. *atha saha-gamanavidhiḥ* // Sdhp.42r.3. *kanyāvivāhasamayē vācayeyur iti dvijāḥ / bhartuḥ saha-carī bhūyah jīvato jīvato pi vā / iti* // Sdhp.42r.4–5 < Sk.P.III.2.7.52.

43. *śaṅkha 'pi* // *nṛte bhartari yā nārī samārohed dhutāśanam / sārundhatī-samācārā svarge loke mahīyate* // Sdhp.42r.5–6 (Śaṅkh.) < Mit. on Yājñ.1.86 (*svargaloke* for *svarge loke*); Par.M.II.i.p.54 (as Mit.; *śaṅkhāṅgirasau*); Dh.kośa I.ii.p.1115 (as Mit.; Aṅg.). See also Sahā. I.1 (Aṅg.).

44. *tathā ca śrutiḥ* // *tasmād u ha na purāyusaḥ preyāt* // *iti* // Sdhp.42r.7 (*śrutiḥ*) < Śat.Br.X.2.6.7 (*svakāmī preyāt* for *preyāt*); Dh.kośa II.i.p.517 (as Śat.Br.). Cf. Medh. on Manu VI.32; Kull. on Manu VI.31.

'people who kill (i.e. are ignorant of) the (true) Self' (cf. Radhakrishnan 1974:570; Hume 1971:361, note 4; PVK II.ii.p.927, Vāj.S.40.3). Tryambaka argues that this 'objection is invalid because the prohibition on suicide is a general rule (*sāmānyavacana*) and is therefore open to modification by supplementary rules giving the exceptions to it (*viśeṣa*). Just as the general rule that 'one should not desire to kill any living being' is modified by supplementary rules—for example, that in certain rituals an animal should be sacrificed—so the general prohibition on suicide is also modified by supplementary rules. These include rulings related to the religious suicide of the ascetic who kills himself at a sacred place in order to go directly to heaven (cf. Yatidh.17.1–32; Olivelle 1977:42–3, 96–8); the deliberate courting of death in battle by the heroic warrior (cf. Yatidh.17.8; Olivelle 1977:97); and—according to Tryambaka—the self-immolation of the widow on her husband's funeral pyre (Sdhp.42r.8–42v.8).

Tryambaka's second argument in favour of the practice is that 'dying with one's husband (*bhartranumaraṇam*) is recommended for women because it brings great rewards.'⁴⁵ Although not spelled out, the crucial issue here is whether the ritual act of *sahagamana* is *naimittika* (i.e. required by the particular 'occasion'; in this case, by the husband's death) or *kāmya* (i.e. to be performed only if one desires the rewards accruing to the action; cf. *nitya*, *naimittika* and *kāmya* in the context of ritual baths, section IIA, p.82). If it is *naimittika*, the widow must join her husband on his pyre; if it is *kāmya*, she only needs to do so if she wants to enjoy the 'great rewards' promised by the scriptures. Tryambaka evidently admits that *sahagamana* is a *kāmya* act and therefore entirely a matter for the individual widow to decide. However, his repeated assertion that it is to be recommended (*ślāghyam, praśastah*), together with his daunting descriptions of the only alternative open to the widow who remains alive (see below, pp.298–304), makes his own opinion on the question abundantly clear.

He proceeds to quote numerous *ślokas* describing the 'great rewards' in store for the pious widow who chooses to die. I have selected some of the more memorable examples. 'The husband is to be followed always (*sahānuyātavy[ah]*): like the body by its shadow, like the moon by moonlight, like a thundercloud by

45. *mahāphalakavād api bhartranumaraṇam strīṇām ślāghyam* // Sdhp. 42v.4.

lightning.⁴⁶ 'There is no doubt that the woman who follows (anuvrajantī) her husband gladly from his house to the cremation ground attains with every step the reward(s) of the horse-sacrifice.'⁴⁷ 'Just as the snake-catcher drags the snake from its hole by force, even so the virtuous wife (satī) snatches her husband from the demons of hell and takes him up to heaven.'⁴⁸ 'Yama's messengers recognize a virtuous wife (satīm) from afar and take to flight. Even if her husband has been an evil man, they let go of him at once, exclaiming, "When we see a devoted wife (pativratām) hurtling towards us (to rescue her husband), we messengers (of Death) are less afraid of fire and lightning than we are of her!"'⁴⁹ 'There are 3½ crores of hairs on a person's body: she who dies with (anugacchati) her husband will dwell in heaven for the same length of time.'⁵⁰ '(Even in the case of) a husband who has entered into hell (itself) and who—seized by the servants of Death and bound with terrible bonds—has arrived at the very place of torment (yātānāsthānam); (even if he is already) standing there, helpless and

46. tathā ca vyāsaḥ // strīnām anugamanaviśaye // Sdhp.42v.4-5. bhartā sahānuvyātavyo dehavac chāyayā sadā / candramā jyotsnayā yadvad vidyutvān vidyutā yathā // Sdhp.42v.5-6 (Vyāsa) < Nirṇ.438 (sahānuvyātavyo for sahānuvyātavyo; striyā for sadā). See also Saha.IV.1b (as Nirṇ.; Sk.P.).

47. anuvrajantī bhartāram grhāt pīrvanam mudā / pade pade 'svamedhasya phalam prāpnoty asaṁśayam // Sdhp.42v.6 (Vyāsa) < Sk.P.III.2.7.53; Nirṇ.438 (anuvrajati for anuvrajantī; grhāt nihsaranam for grhāt pīrvanam). See also Saha.IV.1b (as Nirṇ.; Sk.P.).

48. vyāgrāhī yathā vyālam balād uddharate bilāt / evam utkrṣya daitye-bhyah patim svargam nayet satī // Sdhp.42v.6-7 (Vyāsa) < Sk.P.III.2.7.54 (utkrāmya dūtebhyah for utkrṣya daityebhyah; vrajat for nayet); Par.M.II.i. p.57 (evam strī patim uddhṛtya tenaiva saha modate). For the first half-śloka only (bilād for balād; balāt for bilāt), see Mit. on Yājñ.I.86 (Aṅ.); Apar. on Yājñ.I.87 (Vyāsa); Dh.kośa I.ii.pp.1111,1116,1117; Saha.I.1.

49. yamadūtāḥ palāyante satīm ālokyā dūrataḥ / api duṣkṛtakarmānam samutsṛjya ca tatpatim // na tathā bibhimo vahnēr na tathā vidyuto yathā / āpatantīm samālokyā vayam dūtāḥ pativratām // Sdhp.42v.7-9 (Vyāsa) < Sk.P.III.2.7.55a (first half-śloka only; tām ālokyā pativratām for satīm ālokyā dūrataḥ).

50. parāśaro 'pi // tisrah koṣyo 'rdhakoṣi ca yāni romāni mānuṣe / tāvat kālāṁ vaset svarge bhartāram yānugacchati // Sdhp.43r.1-2 (Par.) < Par.Sm. IV.32; Mit. on Yājñ.I.86 (lomāni for romāni; Śaṅkh., Aṅ.); Dh.kośa I.ii. p.1115 (lomāni for romāni; tāvanty abdāni sā for tāvat kālāṁ vaset; Aṅ.). Cf. Apar.p.110.

wretched, quivering (with fear) because of his evil deeds;⁵¹ even if he is a brahmin-killer or the murderer of a friend, or if he is ungrateful for some service done for him — (even then) a woman who refuses to become a widow (avidhavā nārī) can purify him: in dying, she takes him with her.'⁵² Tryambaka concludes that 'according to established custom as shown in the eloquent statements (given above), this (act of) dying with (one's husband; anumaraṇam) — when put into practice by a devoted wife (pativratayā) — confers great blessings on both (wife and husband).'⁵³

Tryambaka now considers the rewards accruing to the bad wife. 'If (this act of dying with one's husband is) put into practice by a sinful woman, it brings about the destruction of that sin.'⁵⁴ The quotation that follows is quite clear. 'Women who, due to their wicked minds, have previously (i.e. until then) despised their husbands, and who have always behaved disagreeably towards those husbands, who (though) being of that kind (yet) at the (appropriate) time perform the (ritual act of) dying with their husbands (bhartrānumaraṇam) — whether (they do this) of their own free will, or out of anger, or even out of fear — all of them are purified (of sin).'⁵⁵ This is the scriptural justification for forcing women to burn themselves. Whatever their reason for doing so, whatever the past

51. vyāsaḥ // yadi praviṣṭo narakam baddhaḥ pāśaiḥ sudāruṇaiḥ / samprāpto yātānāsthānam grhīto yamakinkaraiḥ / tiṣṭhate vivaśo dīno vepamānaḥ svakarmabhiḥ // Sdhp.43r.4-5 (Vyāsa) < Apar. on Yājñ.I.87 (veṣṭhamānaḥ for vepamānaḥ; Vyāsa); Dh.kośa I.ii.p.1111 (as Apar.); Par.M.II.i.p.57 (as Apar.) Cf. Saha.I.7. (dīno 'nda bhujiyamānaḥ for dīno vepamānaḥ).

52. brahmaghno vā kṛtaghno vā mitraghno vā bhavet patiḥ / punāty avidhavā nārī tam ādāya mṛtā tu yā // Sdhp.43r.5-6 (Vyāsa) < Mit. on Yājñ.I.86; Par.M.II.i.p.57; Dh.kośa I.ii.p.1111 (brahmaghne vā kṛtaghne vā mitraghne yac ca duṣkṛtam / bhartuḥ punāty sā nārī tam ādāya mṛtā tu yā; Vyāsa). Cf. Apar.I.87; Mit. on Yājñ.I.72; Dh.kośa I.ii.p.1116 (Aṅ.).

53. idam cānumaraṇam pativratayānuṣṭhitam sadukṛtāyā ubhayoḥ śreyo-hetuḥ // Sdhp.43r.6-7. Cf. Par.M.II.i.p.57-8 (cānugamaṇam for cānumaraṇam; dampatyor ubhayoḥ for ubhayoḥ).

54. pāpiyānuṣṭhitam cet pāpakṣayahetuḥ // Sdhp.43r.7. Cf. Par.M.II.i. p.58 ('hetur bhavati for hetuḥ).

55. tathā ca saṁgrāhe // bhārate // Sdhp.43r.7. avamatya ca yāḥ pūrvam patim duṣṭena cetasa / vartante yās ca satatam bhartṛmām pratikūlagāḥ // bhartrānumaraṇam kāle yāḥ kurvanti tathāvidhāḥ / kāmāt krodhād bhayād

deeds of either husband or wife; the sacrifice purifies both of them. As a result of this (ruling), Tryambaka concludes, 'when *sahagamana* is performed by a woman who has done wrong — that is, what her husband did not like (cf. section V) — throughout her lifetime, (then) it is said to have the quality of a *prāyaścitta*.'⁵⁶ In this sense, it is the ultimate, and only effective, *prāyaścitta* for the bad wife.

As Tryambaka admits, however, this conclusion conflicts with the special rulings relating to the *kali* age (Sdhp.43v.1–3; cf. *kali-varjya*, PVK III. p.926–68). One of these is that the rite of atonement that culminates in death (*marañāntikapṛāyaścitta*) is prohibited in the *kali* age. The quotation is unambiguous. 'These duties (i.e. those listed in the previous unquoted passages) are to be avoided in the *kali* age, say learned men; as is the prescribing to brahmins of any rite of atonement (*prāyaścitta*) that culminates in death.'⁵⁷ Tryambaka merely sidesteps the problem, remarking that whether or not the bad wife should perform *sahagamana* to wipe out her sins is best left to great men to decide (*kartavyam na kartavyam iti mahadbhir vivecanīyam*; Sdhp.43v.3).

Tryambaka's weakness as a *mīmāṃsaka* is evident. For there are two crucial issues here: whether or not *sahagamana* is really a *prāyaścitta* for the bad wife; and, if so, whether this particular *marañāntikapṛāyaścitta* is in fact prohibited in the *kali* age. Tryambaka argues neither well. Instead, he embarks on a lengthy (and poorly structured) explanation of why it is important for a wife to behave properly during her and her husband's lifetime (Sdhp.43v.3–44v.3). If there is no *marañāntikapṛāyaścitta* for the errant wife, then she cannot escape the torments awaiting her in the next world. For — according to a variety of quotations — even if she has bathed in all the sacred places, the bad wife will go to the hell of dung and

vāpi sarvāḥ pūtā bhavanti uta // Sdhp.43r.7–9 (Mbh.) < Sm. M.I. p.163 (*pratikūlatāḥ* for 'gāḥ; *bhayan* *mohāt* for *bhayād vāpi*; Vyāsaśātātapaḥ); Par. M.II. i.p.58 (as Sm. M. except *tu* for *ca*; *bhavanti tāḥ* for *bhavanti uta*; Mbh.); Mbh. XIII appendix I no.15, 4660–3, 4665–6. Cf. Sahā. I.2 (as Par. M. except *ca* for *tu*).

56. *anena jīva[nada]śāyām bhartṛvipriyam pāpam kṛtavatyāḥ sahaḡamanam prāyaścittatvenoktam* // Sdhp.43r.9–10 (following the emendation of PT).

57. *kalau yuge tv imān dharmān varjyān āhur manīṣiṇaḥ / prāyaścitta-vidhānam ca vipṛāṇām marañāntikam* // Sdhp.43v.1–2 < Sm. A.p.2, śloka 25b, 21b.

urine (*vinmūtre narake*), or burning oil (*taptatailanarakam*); she will be a widow, or a bitch, or a sow in her next life; she will be infested with worms in this one; and so on. Since statements such as these make no reference to any other *prāyaścitta* that can wipe out the effects of a wife's bad behaviour (*prāyaścittāntarābhāvāc ca sarvathā*; Sdhp.44r.10–44v.1), Tryambaka suggests that there is none (that is, he implies, none other than *sahagamana*). The wife's only hope is to worship and placate her husband at every turn. The inadequacy of Tryambaka's reasoning on this point becomes clear when one compares it with, for example, that in the *Mitākṣarā* on Yājñ. III.226. Tryambaka's intention, however, is transparent. He is evidently suggesting that, despite the rulings regarding the *kali* age, *sahagamana* is in fact the safest course of action for the not-so-perfect wife.

Tryambaka raises one final question. 'Now the objection may be made (*nanu*) that this (practice of) dying with one's husband (*anugamanam*) is applicable to *kṣatriya* women and so on (i.e. to the lower *varṇas*), but prohibited to brahmin women.'⁵⁸ Several quotations are produced in favour of this view. For example, 'as a result of Brahmā's instruction, following one's husband when he has died (*mṛtānugamanam*) is not appropriate for brahmin women; but, for the other *varṇas*, this is held to be the supreme duty for women.'⁵⁹ Or, 'the brahmin woman who does not die with her husband, (even though she is) distracted by grief, obtains the goal of renunciation (*pravrajyā*; glossed by Tryambaka as *brahmacaryam*; i.e. *vidhavādharma*, see below); (whereas) by dying, she becomes one who has committed suicide (*ātmaḡhātini*; i.e. she incurs the sin thereof).'⁶⁰ According to Tryambaka, however, such statements in fact prohibit brahmin women from ascending

58. *nanu idam anugamanam kṣatriyānyādīnām bhavatu / brāhmanyās tu niśiddham* // Sdhp.44v.3–4.

59. *tathā ca paithīnasiḥ // mṛtānugamanam nāsti brāhmanyā brahmaśāsanāt / itareṣāṃ tu varṇānām strīdharmo 'yaṃ para[h] smṛtaḥ* // Sdhp.44v.4–5 (Paithīnasi; PT gives *dharmo 'yaṃ paramaḥ smṛtaḥ*) < Apar. p.112 (Paithīnasi); Mit. on Yājñ. I.86 (*itareṣu tu varṇeṣu tapaḥ paramaḥ smṛtaḥ*); Dh. kośa I.ii. p.1115 (as Mit.: Paithīnasi). Cf. Sahā. III.1.

60. *vyāghrapādaḥ na mriyeta samaḡ bhartṛā brāhmaṇī śokamohitā / pravrajyāgatim āpnoti marañād ātmaḡhātini* // Sdhp.44v.9–45r.1 (Vyāghrapāda) < Apar. p.112 (Vyāghrapāda); Dh. kośa I.ii. p.1117.

a separate pyre (*pr̥thakcityārohaṇaparavāt*; Sdhp.45r.2-3). The implication here is that the chief or brahmin wife, the *patnī*, should join her husband on his pyre (*anvārohaṇa*) while the junior wives of lower *varṇa* should burn on separate ones (*anumaraṇa*). As the quotation from Uśanas explains, 'a brahmin woman should not go (i.e. die) by ascending (*samāruhya*) a separate pyre, but for other women this is the ancient duty for wives.'⁶¹

Tryambaka's conclusion is obvious. 'The religious duty (or practice) of dying with one's husband is commended (*praśastah*) for women,'⁶² whether brahmins or not, whether good or bad.

The religious duties of the widow (*vidhavādharmāḥ*; Sdhp.45r.5-48v.6)

Judging by his previous section, Tryambaka believes that the best course of action open to the widow is that of dying with her husband. The way in which he opens this section reinforces that view.

'If for some reason, by some stroke of fate (*daivayogāt*), she does not follow her husband (*anuyāti*), then her virtue (*śīlam*) must be protected; for if her virtue is lost, she falls down (to hell).'⁶³ More important perhaps, her loss of virtue (*śīlam*) causes her husband to fall from heaven (*svargāt patih patati*; i.e. into hell), and her parents and brothers too (Sdhp.45r.7-8; Āśv. in the *Pārijāta*). The 'stroke of fate' implies that the wife in question is pregnant, menstruating or caring for a small infant when her husband dies (see Par.M.II.i.p.58-9; Sm.M.I.p.162; Sahā.I.8, etc.; cf. PVK II.i.p.633). Of these, the menstruating woman may burn herself after her ritual bath on the fourth day (cf. pp.286-7).

Tryambaka then describes the conduct that will ensure that the

61. *tathā ca uśanā // pr̥thakcityārohaṇaparavāt na viprā gantum arhati / anyā-sām caiva nārīṇāṃ strīdharmo 'yam sanātanaḥ // iti // Sdhp.45r.3-4* (Uśanas) < Par.M.II.i.p.56 (*paraḥ smṛtaḥ* for *sanātanaḥ*); Sm.M.I.p.162 (as Par.M.; Uśanas); Apar.p.112 (as Par.M.); Dh.kośa I.ii.p.1113 (Uśanas). Cf. Mit. on Yājñ.I.86; Sahā.I.8 (as Par.M.).

62. *evam anugamanadharmāḥ strīṇāṃ praśastah // Sdhp.45r.5.*

63. *pārijāt(e) āśvalāyanah // anuyāti na bhartāraṃ daivayogāt kathamcana / tathāpi śīlam samrakṣyam śīlabhaṅgāt pataty adhaḥ // Sdhp.45r.6-7* (Āśv. in the *Pārijāta*) < ?

widow's virtue is safe. For the rest of her days, she should live the subdued and restricted life of the celibate student (*kṣāntā niyatā brahmacārīṇī*; Sdhp.45r.9, Manu < Manu V.158) as opposed to the life of the married woman with all its outward signs of happiness and ornamentation (cf. section IIA, pp.88-101). She should willingly mortify her body (*kāmaṃ tu kṣaped deham*), living on flowers, roots and fruits (Sdhp.45v.10, Manu < Manu V.157); or, alternatively, on fruits, vegetables and barley (Sdhp.45v.3, Āśv.). She should eat only once a day, and in addition she should perform regular severe fasts (Sdhp.45r.1-3, Āśv. < Sm.M.I.p.160, etc.). She should wear undyed (*vṛktam*) garments, no bodice (*kañcukam*), no perfumes (*gandhadravya*) or unguents (*udvartanam*; Sdhp.46r.6-8, Āśv.; cf. section IIA, pp.88-101). If she binds her hair on top of her head (*kabaribandha*), she causes her husband to be bound in the other world (*bhartṛbandhāya jāyate*, Sdhp.46r.5, Āśv.; cf. section IIA, pp.96-101). She should sleep on the ground (*bhūṣa-yanam kāryam*), never on a 'high bed' (*paryāṅka*; Sdhp.45v.4-5, Āśv. < Sm.M.I.p.160, etc.; cf. section IID, pp.236-45). She should not even mention the name of another man (Sdhp.45v.10-11, Manu < Manu V.157), nor have any sort of contact with him (Tryambaka's gloss; Sdhp.45v.11-46r.1).

In fact, her lifestyle is repeatedly compared with that of the ascetic or Vedic student (for similar associations in south India today, see Fuller and Logan 1985:89ff.). For example, 'the ascetic (or renouncer; *yati*), the celibate student (*brahmacārī*) and the widow should avoid (chewing) betel (cf. sections IIA, pp.96-101, and IIC, pp.229-33, anointing (their bodies with oils or unguents; cf. section IIA, pp.96-101), and eating off copper or brass vessels (cf. section IIC, pp.217-21; Yatidh.57.79-92; Olivelle 1977:37, 168).'⁶⁴ In other examples, the parallel is made by specifically calling the widow's way of life (*vidhavāvṛata*) 'renunciation' (e.g. *pravrajyā*; see above, note 60) or, in the widest sense, 'the celibate life' (e.g. *brahmacārīṇī*, Sdhp.45r.9, Manu < Manu V.158; *brahmacaryam*, Sdhp.46r.4, Āp.; etc.). But the widow may never leave

64. *samvartah // tāmbūlābhyañjanam caiva kāmśyapātre ca bhojanam / yatiś ca brahmacārī ca vidhavā ca vivarjayet // iti // Sdhp.46v.1-2* (Samvarta) < Sm.C.II.p.602 (Pracetā); Dh.kośa I.ii.p.1117 (*tāmbūlābhyañjane* for '*nam*'; Pracetā).

home as a true renunciate. Tryambaka explains. 'Forsaking sons, brothers and other (male relatives) after her husband (dies), and living independently, incurs condemnation.'⁶⁵ For a woman may never act independently (see above, p.276, note 9); as a widow, her dependence is simply transferred from husband to sons. Indeed, 'the woman (i.e. widow) who is (truly) devoted to her husband should not do anything without (first) asking her sons.'⁶⁶

Devotion to one's husband, even after his death, thus remains the key point of the widow's life. If she has no son (*putrābhāve*; Tryambaka's gloss), she should make funeral offerings (*tarpaṇam* . . . *kāryam*) to her husband daily, and to his father and grandfather (Sdhp. 45v.5-6, Āśv.). 'She may worship Viṣṇu (but only) if she thinks (all the time) of her husband, not otherwise. She should meditate on her husband alone, always; that is, (on her husband) in the auspicious guise of (the god) Viṣṇu.'⁶⁷ For she (i.e. the widow) who takes refuge in the religious duty of the virtuous wife (*satī-dharmam*) should always worship her husband, bringing him to mind by means of a portrait or a clay model.'⁶⁸

Not surprisingly, Tryambaka makes no mention of or allowance for the remarriage of widows. However, he does raise the question of *niyoga*, a practice much discussed in commentarial and digest writing. The point at issue is whether or not the widow of a man who dies without a son may, after her husband's death, have sexual intercourse with another man 'appointed' (*niyukta*) to produce that son for him. The problem is caused once again by a conflict of rulings. On the one hand, a widow should not even mention the name of another man (see above), let alone have intercourse with

65. *bhartranantaram putrabhrātrādīn parityajya svātantryeṇāvasthāne nindāpi* // Sdhp.46r.9. Cf. Sdhp.46r.10-46v.1 (Yājñ.) < Yājñ.1.86.

66. *apṛstīva tu sūtān kimcin na kuryād bhartrītatparā* // Sdhp.46r.8-9 (Āśv.) < ?

67. *āśvalāyaṇaḥ* // Sdhp.45v.1. *viṣṇo tu pūjanam kāryam patibuddhyā na cānyathā / patim eva sadā dhyāyēd viṣṇurūpadharam śivam* // Sdhp.45v.7-8 (Āśv.) < Sm.M.I.p.161 (*param* for *śivam*; Vyāsa); Sk P.III.2.7.70 (*supūjanam* for *tu pūjanam*; *harim* for *śivam*).

68. *harivaṃśe vidhavādharmaṇ prakṛtya* // Sdhp.45v.8. *patim samkalpayitvā [tu] citrastham vāpi mṛṇmayam / tasya pūjām sadā kuryāt satīdharmam upāśritā* // Sdhp.45v.9-10 (following PT, I have inserted *tu* to fit the metre; Hariv.) < ? Not in Hariv. crit. edn. index.

him. On the other hand, a woman is at fault if she does not bear a son; and a man without a son is barred from heaven.

Tryambaka presents the *pūrvapakṣa* argument in favour of *niyoga* first. A blanket prohibition on sexual intercourse with a man other than one's husband is inappropriate (*anupapannam*) 'because even though blame is attached to sexual intercourse with another man for the sake of pleasure, it is necessary for the purpose of (producing) a son.'⁶⁹ The evidence for this is derived from the story of Jaratkāru in the *Mahābhārata*. Threatened with the extinction of their line (*saṃtanaprakṣayāt*), and the dire consequence that they will all fall into hell, Jaratkāru's ancestors entreat him to produce a son (Sdhp.47[1]r.2-3; cf. Mbh.I.13.9-34). For 'there is no heaven for one who has no son.'⁷⁰

The next step in the argument in favour of *niyoga* is the ruling that 'in the absence of a natural (*aurasa*) son, it is necessary that a *kṣetraja* son should be acquired.'⁷¹ In this context, the 'field' (*kṣetra*) is the wife and the 'owner of the field' (*kṣetrin*) is her husband. The son 'born of his field' (*kṣetraja*) is the son born to a man's wife by another man on his behalf; whether the husband in question is dead or incapacitated (e.g. by impotence, disease or a curse). The sower or 'owner of the seed' (*bījin*) is the man 'appointed' (*niyogin*) for this task. For the traditional list of the kinds of sons deemed acceptable for the two crucial purposes of making *śrāddha* offerings to the ancestors (*piṇḍadāne*) and dividing the inheritance (*aṃśagrahane*), Tryambaka quotes at length from Yājñavalkya (Sdhp.47[1]r.5.5-9 < Yājñ.II.128-32). According to this quotation, the *kṣetraja* comes third in order of importance; that is, after the son born to a man by his own wife (i.e. married according to the proper religious ritual; *auraso dharmapatnījah*), and the son of a *putrikā* daughter (*putrikāsutaḥ*, Sdhp.47[1]r.5-6; for a discussion of the *putrikā*, see section IIB, pp.146-7). Tryambaka draws further evidence from the story of Paraśurāma in the *Mahābhārata*. When Paraśurāma killed all the male *kṣatriyas*, their widows asked brahmins to produce sons with them on behalf of their dead hus-

69. *bhogārtham parapuruṣaṅgasya ninditave 'pi putrārtham tasyāvaśyākatvāt* // Sdhp.47(1)r.1-2.

70. *nāputrasya hi loko 'sti // iti śrutā . . .* // Sdhp.47(1)r.2 (*śruti*) < Sm.C.III.ii.p.595 (*yat tu śrutāṃ uktam nāputrasya loko 'stīti*).

71. *aurasābhāve kṣetrajasyāvaśyam sampādaniyatvāt* // Sdhp.47(1)r.3-4.

bands (Sdhp.47[1]r.9–13 < Mbh.1.98.3b–5). Finally, Tryambaka cites the well-known examples of Kuntī, Ambikā, Ambālikā and so on, all of whom had sons by the practice of *niyoga* (Sdhp.47[1]r.13–14; cf. section V, pp.309–10).

According to Tryambaka, however, the *pūrvapakṣa* position is untenable. Only two kinds of son are acceptable in the *kali* age: the *aurasa* and the adopted son (*dattaka*, *datta*; Sdhp.47[1]r.14–47[1]v.2). This in turn raises the question of whether, if a man dies without a son, his widow may adopt on his behalf. According to Tryambaka, she may, but only if her husband gives his consent to adoption before he dies (Sdhp.47[1]v.2–5). For, according to Baudhāyana, 'a woman may not give or take a son except with the consent of her husband.'⁷² If he dies without giving his consent, she may not adopt; but neither may she resort to the practice of *niyoga*. Instead, she must devote herself totally to the celibate life already described (*brahmacaryavrata*, *vidhavāvratā*). Tryambaka quotes Manu. 'Many thousands of men who have remained celibate (*brahmacārīṇām*) from their boyhood, and who are (therefore) without sons, have (nonetheless) gone to heaven without (first) continuing their family line. (Similarly,) when her husband dies, the virtuous woman (*sādhvī strī*) who has taken up the celibate life (*brahmacaryavrate*) goes to heaven even if she has no son, just like those male celibates (*brahmacārīṇaḥ*).'⁷³

In section V, however, the question of *niyoga* is approached from another angle altogether, and with the opposite conclusion: if a man *wants* his wife to practise *niyoga* then what is strictly speaking wrong becomes right (see section V, pp.309–10).

Tryambaka also discusses the interesting question of the im-

72. *tathā ca taccheṣe bodhāyanah // na tu strī putram dadyāt pratigrhñyād vānyatrabhyanujñānād bhartuh // iti //* Sdhp.47 (1)v.4–5 (*Baudhāyanagrhyasūtra*) < Dh.kośa I.ii.p.1384 (*Baudhāyanagrhyasūtra*; 'ānujñānād for 'ābhyanujñānād) and p.1273 (as p.1384 except *tu* omitted; Vas.); Vas.15.5 (as Dh.kośa I.ii.p.1273).

73. *tathā ca manuḥ // Sdhp.47(1)v.7. anekāni sahasrāṇi kaumārabrahmacārīṇām / divam gatāny aputrāṇām akṛtvā kulasaṃtatim // mṛte bhartari sādhvī strī brahmacaryavrate sthitā / svargaṃ gacchaty aputrāpi yathā te brahmacārīṇaḥ //* Sdhp.47(1)v.8–10 (Manu) < Manu V.159–60 (*kumāra* for *kaumāra*; *viprāṇām* for *aputrāṇām*; *brahmacarye* *vyavasthitā* for *brahmacaryavrate sthitā*); Sm.C.III.iii.p.595 (Manu; as Manu except *kaumāra* for *kumāra*); Dh.kośa I.ii.p.1062–3 (as Manu; Manu).

purity and inauspiciousness traditionally ascribed to widows. The examples he quotes are typical. 'Just as the body, bereft of life, in that moment becomes impure, so the woman bereft of her husband is always impure, even if she has bathed properly. Of all inauspicious things, the widow is the most inauspicious; there can never be any success after seeing a widow (cf. section IIA, pp.54–7). The wise man should avoid even her blessing (*tadāśiṣam api*)—excepting only that of his mother—for it is devoid of all auspiciousness, like the poison of a snake (*āśviṣopamām*).'⁷⁴

According to Tryambaka, however, such remarks apply only to the widow who does not behave as she ought (*ācārāhīnāviṣayam*; Sdhp.47[2]r.4–5). For even if she becomes a widow, the *pativrata*—'who is devoted to (good) conduct' (*caryāparā*), 'fully committed to her religious duty' (*dharmaśamayukta*), and 'who follows (the proper path of) widowhood' (*vaidhavyam palayet*)—earns a three-fold reward: she is both happy and auspicious (*śubhā*) in this life; she obtains the pleasures of heaven (*svargabhogān*), or indeed the same heaven as her husband (*patilokam*); and she marries that same husband again in her next life (Sdhp.47[2]r.5–7). Theoretically at least, if she behaves as she should (see above), the dread inauspiciousness with which the scriptures threaten her are cancelled out. But if she cannot do this, she would presumably be well-advised to die with her husband.

Tryambaka finally raises the question of whether or not the widow should shave her head. In south India today, widows are in fact traditionally tonsured after the funeral (cf. Fuller and Logan 1985:95) but this is a late development calculated to bring the widow in line with other 'renouncers' (cf. Yatidh.21.39,104–5; Olivelle 1977:38,104–6). Tryambaka argues that '(rulings that prescribe) shaving the head (*śirasō vapanam*) apply to brahmin women; (those prescribing) keeping the hair (long apply) to women of other castes.'⁷⁵ The quotation is taken from the *Mahābhārata* where

74. *vyāsaḥ // jīvahino yathā dehaḥ kṣaṇād aśucitām vrajet / bhartṛhīnā tathā yoṣit susnātāpy aśuciḥ sadā // amaṅgalebhyah sarvebhyo vidhavā hy atya-maṅgalam / vidhavādarśanāt siddhiḥ kāpi jātu na jāyate // vihāya mātaram caikāṃ sarvamaṅgalavarjitām / tadāśiṣam api prājñas tyajed āśviṣopamām // iti //* Sdhp.47[2]r.1–4 (Vyāsa) < Sk.P.III.2.7.49–51 (*dehī* for *dehaḥ*; *syād* for *hy aty*; *kvāpi* for *kāpi*; *sarvā maṅgalavarjitāḥ* for *sarvamaṅgalavarjitām*).

75. *śirasō vapanam brāhmaṇiṣayam / itarajātiyastrīṇām keśadhāraṇam eva //* Sdhp.47(2)r.8.

Dhṛtarāṣṭra's widowed daughters-in-law (i.e. *kṣatriya* women) are described as having dishevelled hair (*asīmantaśīroruhā[h]*, lit. 'without a parting'; Sdhp.47[2]r.8–10 < Mbh.XV.32.15).

In contexts other than widowhood (e.g. for certain *prāyaścitta* rituals when performed by unmarried girls or women whose husbands are alive), the phrase 'shaving the head' (*śirasō muṇḍanam*) is taken to mean simply cutting two fingers' breadth (*aṅgulidvayam*) off the ends of the hair (Sdhp.47[2]v.1–3; cf. Bhardwaj 1983:154). In fact, as Tryambaka explains, the four main prohibitions relating to the performance by women of certain aspects (or component elements; *aṅga*) of *vratas* include a prohibition on shaving the head (*keśavapanam*). The other three concern sleeping or staying far from home (*dūre śayanāsanam*); staying in the cow-pen at night, or following cows about in dangerous places during the day; and wearing deerskins (*ajinam vāś[ah]*; Sdhp.47[2]v.6–8).

Tryambaka concludes that three kinds of women merit the name of *pativrata*: the wife who dies before her husband (*bhartuḥ pūrvam mṛtā*) and patiently waits for him to join her; the wife who follows her husband onto the funeral pyre (*bhartrā sahānugatā*), exemplified by Mādrī; and the wife who after her husband's death lives an ascetic and celibate life for the rest of her days (*yāvajjīvam brahmācaryādīnā yuktā*), exemplified by Kuntī. The first kind of wife is the auspicious ideal. But if the husband dies first, inauspiciousness and misfortune may be offset by either of the two options open to his widow. While the second alternative is deemed safer than the third—given the nature of women and the difficulties of leading a truly ascetic life—all three earn the ultimate reward of reaching the same heaven as their husbands (*patisālokyam*; Sdhp.48r.9–48v.6).

V. Tryambaka's Conclusion: Obedient Service to one's Husband is the Primary Religious Duty (of a wife)

(*patiśuśrūṣaṇam mukhyo dharmah*;
Sdhp.48v. 7–88r. 1).

Tryambaka returns to the point at which he began. 'Obedient service to one's husband (*bhartrśuśrūṣaṇam*, Sdhp.1v.2; *patiśuśrūṣaṇam*, Sdhp.48v.7) is the primary religious duty enjoined by sacred tradition for women' (see section I, introductory verse 1, p.29, note 2). In this section, he defines 'obedient service to one's husband' in three ways. First, a wife should serve her husband 'without regard for her own life' (*prāṇānām avigaṇanayā*). Secondly, she should accept whatever her husband does 'even the sale of herself' (*ātma-vikraya*). Thirdly, she should obey his will 'even when it conflicts with other religious duties' (*itaradharmopamardena*).¹ Most of the rest of the treatise is taken up with some short and some extremely long examples of these three aspects of *patiśuśrūṣaṇam*. I shall deal briefly with the most important ones.

As suggested in my introduction, this unwieldy section was probably intended for the ears of the young daughters-in-law of the household (cf. pp.9–10). This would explain the long quotations from well-known stories and the marked lack of any real argument. It was presumably hoped that such lengthy retellings of favourite and traditional tales would inspire impressionable young women to conform to the highest ideals of *strīdharmā*.

Without regard for her own life (*prāṇānām avigaṇanayā*;
Sdhp.48v.8–55r.8)

When Sītā sees Rāma and Lakṣmaṇa being carried off by a powerful demon, she begs the demon to release them and take her instead

1. *patiśuśrūṣaṇam tu prāṇānām avigaṇanayā kartavyatvāt[] bhartrkṛt-ātma-vikrayasyāṅgikartavyatvāt[] itaradharmopamardena ca kartavyatvāt[] patiśuśrūṣaṇam mukhyo dharmah* // Sdhp.48v.7–8 with insert.